

1 Daniel J. Herling (SBN 103711)  
Lina M. Brenner (SBN 191075)  
2 DUANE MORRIS LLP  
One Market, Spear Tower, Suite 2000  
3 San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: (415) 371-2200  
4 Facsimile: (415) 371-2201

5 Richard T. Redano (*pro hac vice*)  
Gary R. Maze (*pro hac vice*)  
6 One Greenway Plaza, Suite 500  
Houston, TX 77046  
7 Telephone: (713) 964-7700  
Facsimile: (713) 964-7701

8 Attorneys for Defendant  
9 THOMSON, INC.

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

11 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – SACRAMENTO DIVISION

12 TECHNOLOGY LICENSING )  
CORPORATION, a California )  
13 Corporation )

14 Plaintiff, )

15 vs. )

16 THOMSON, INC., a Delaware )  
Corporation )

17 Defendant. )  
18 \_\_\_\_\_ )

Case No. CIV S-03-1329 WBS PAN

**[PROPOSED] ORDER RE DEFENDANT  
THOMSON, INC.'S EMERGENCY MOTION  
SEEKING RELIEF FROM LOCAL RULES  
GOVERNING SERVICE OF MOTIONS**

**JUDGE:** The Hon. William B. Shubb

19 \_\_\_\_\_ / / / /  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27


1 Having reviewed Defendant Thomson, Inc.'s ("Thomson") Emergency Motion Seeking Relief From  
2 Local Rules Governing Service of Motions, and having entertained any and all opposition to same, the Court  
3 finds as follows:

4 Given that plaintiff Technology Licensing Corporation's counsel received electronic notice and  
5 service of Thomson's Motion Seeking An Extension of Time To File Rebuttal Expert Reports (the "Motion")  
6 on April 4, 2005, the day on which such Motion was filed, and twenty-eight (28) days prior to the scheduled  
7 hearing date of May 2, 2005, the Court will permit the Motion to be heard on the latter date.

8 Because a copy of the motion pleadings was sent to plaintiff's counsel by mail rather than by  
9 personal service in accordance with the requirements of Local Rule 78-230(b) on April 4, 2005, plaintiff's  
10 counsel is given an additional three court days to file its opposition to the motion. Given such additional  
11 time, the Court finds that plaintiff's counsel has not been prejudiced, and that it would serve judicial and  
12 party economy were the Court to permit the Motion to be heard on May 2, 2005, given that the parties will  
13 already be appearing before the Court concerning another motion filed by the plaintiff.

14 IT IS SO ORDERED

15 Dated: April 15, 2005

16  
17   
18 WILLIAM B. SHUBB  
19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27